

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-33 and 35-40 were pending in the application and Claims 1-12, 33, and 35-40 were under consideration in the application with Claims 13-32 having been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 15, 21, 24, 31, and 33 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated February 7, 2008, Claims 1-12, 33 and 35-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-12, 33, and 35-38 remain under consideration in this application with Claim 13-14 and 39-40 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

#### **I. Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 3, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. While the Examiner indicated that the current amendments overcome the currently cited references, no agreement was reached regarding patentability.

#### **II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action dated February 7, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 33 and 35-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 10/378,273 ("*Bjoernsen*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,213,051 ("*Zhu*") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,447 ("*Estrada*"). Claims 1 and 33 have

been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "including a section displaying a plurality of icons, each icon for selecting a view associated with one from a set of: an alert list, a collaborator list, a task list, a document list, a web browser, and a help menu, and the collaboration pane operative to display the collaboration data, wherein the collaboration data comprises, when an icon associated with the task list is selected, at least one task list identifying: at least one task to be performed; a subject matter of the at least one task; a priority of the at least one task; and a due date for completion of the task".

Amended Claim 33 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 3, lines 21-38, page 4, lines 23-27, page 21, lines 25-30, and page 22, lines 5-10 and lines 25-30; figures 6-14 and associated text.

In contrast, *Bjoernsen* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Bjoernsen* discloses a launch pad that launches in a portal tool area and displays as a view in the portal tool area. (See *Bjoernsen*, paragraph [0079].) *Bjoernsen*'s launch pad can display a number of collaboration services with service availability tied to a user's permissions settings. (See *Bjoernsen*, paragraph [0083].) Services in *Bjoernsen*'s launchpad may include e-mail, chat, and instant messaging. (See *Bjoernsen*, paragraph [0083].) However, *Bjoernsen* does not teach or suggest a section in a collaboration pane displaying icons for selecting an alert list, a collaborator list, a task list, a document list, a web browser, or a help menu. Moreover, *Bjoernsen* does not teach or suggest that the collaboration pane displays collaboration data.

Furthermore, *Bjoernsen* does not teach or suggest collaboration data that includes, if selected, a task list identifying tasks with a subject matter, a priority, and a due date for completion. Rather, *Bjoernsen* merely allows users to view each other's meeting resources such as applications, chat sessions, instant messaging, and desktops.

Furthermore, *Zhu* does not overcome *Bjoernsen*'s deficiencies. *Zhu* merely discloses that a presenter can share a meeting recording file with attendees. (See *Zhu* col. 128, lines 52-53.) When the presenter opens *Zhu*'s meeting recorder, a recording displays within a content viewer window, creates a new tab, and comes to the forefront. (See *Zhu* col. 128, lines 54-58.) With *Zhu*'s meeting recorder, a player control panel appears along with a new tab for a recording file and may stay on top. (See *Zhu* pp. 128, lines 61-63.) Like *Bjoernsen*, *Zhu* at least does not teach or suggest a section in a collaboration pane displaying icons for selecting an alert list, a collaborator list, a task list, a document list, a web browser, or a help menu. Moreover, *Zhu* also does not teach or suggest that the collaboration pane displays collaboration data. Furthermore, *Zhu* does not teach or suggest collaboration data that includes, if selected, a task list identifying tasks with a subject matter, a priority, and a due date for completion. Rather, *Zhu* merely reveals an application that records meeting proceedings and displays in the forefront.

Moreover, *Estrada* does not overcome *Bjoernsen*'s and *Zhu*'s deficiencies. *Estrada* merely discloses that users in a collaboration space can view a tasks page as a timeline. (See *Estrada* col. 48, lines 60-61.) *Estrada*'s tasks page may be presented in a list mode with user provided buttons for selecting a desired format and other options. (See *Estrada* col. 48, lines 64-66.) Like *Bjoernsen* and *Zhu*, *Estrada* does not teach or

suggest a section in a collaboration pane displaying icons, each icon for selecting an alert list, a collaborator list, a task list, a document list, a web browser, or a help menu. Moreover, *Estrada* also does not teach or suggest that the collaboration pane displays collaboration data. Furthermore, *Estrada* also does not teach or suggest collaboration data that includes, if selected, tasks with a subject matter, a priority, and a due date for completion. Rather, *Estrada* merely discloses a timeline format to display tasks and configuration options to further modify the timeline format to fit a user's display needs.

Combining *Bjoernsen* with *Zhu* and *Estrada* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Bjoernsen*, *Zhu*, and *Estrada* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "including a section displaying a plurality of icons, each icon for selecting a view associated with one from a set of: an alert list, a collaborator list, a task list, a document list, a web browser, and a help menu, and the collaboration pane operative to display the collaboration data, wherein the collaboration data comprises, wherein the collaboration data comprises, when an icon associated with the task list is selected, at least one task list identifying: at least one task to be performed; a subject matter of the at least one task; a priority of the at least one task; and a due date for completion of the task," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 33 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 33 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 33.

Dependent Claims 2-12 and 35-38 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 33, and by virtue of their

respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-12, and 35-38.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Final Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: May 7, 2008

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:kek

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE